From Equality to Equivalence: Recasting the Foundations of Mathematics through Category Theory and Homotopy Type Theory

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

August 19, 2025

For centuries, the equality sign "=" has stood as the cornerstone of mathematics. To declare $x = y$ was to assert an absolute identity, a blunt yet powerful tool that allowed substitution, calculation, and proof. This rigid notion of sameness supported the development of algebra, geometry, and analysis, but it also concealed an underlying richness: many mathematical objects we call "equal" are not identical in substance, but rather structurally similar. The symbol "=" thus compresses complexity into a single flat assertion, obscuring the deeper web of relationships that binds mathematical structures together. The advent of Category Theory and Homotopy Type Theory, and especially Voevodsky's univalence axiom, redefines this foundation. In this new framework, equivalence—not equality—is primitive. Two entities are considered "the same" when they are equivalent in structure, and equivalence itself may unfold across higher paths, homotopies, and coherence laws. This transition from "=" to "$\simeq$" transforms sameness from a statement into a universe of structured correspondences, reshaping mathematics and opening fresh perspectives in physics, computer science, artificial intelligence, and even philosophy.

Keywords: equality, equivalence, univalence, Voevodsky, category theory, homotopy type theory, identity types, mathematics foundations, pedagogy, structuralism. A collaboration with GPT-5. CC4.0.

1. Introduction: The Limits of Equality

From its earliest appearance in the sixteenth century, the equality sign "=" has stood as one of the most recognizable symbols in mathematics. Introduced by Robert Recorde in *The Whetstone of Witte* (1557), the symbol was designed for simplicity: two parallel strokes, "because no two things can be more equal." For centuries, this device provided a compact way of declaring that two quantities, expressions, or objects were identical. Whether balancing equations in algebra, calculating areas in geometry, or setting boundary conditions in calculus, the "=" sign became the universal declaration of sameness, shaping generations of mathematical practice and pedagogy.

The power of equality lies in its utility. By asserting $x = y$, mathematicians can substitute one term for another, collapsing complexity into a single form. This operation is what allows equations to be solved, identities to be verified, and proofs to be constructed with precision. Equality has underwritten entire branches of mathematics, from number theory to differential equations, and it has allowed mathematics to serve as the rigorous language of science. Without the convenience of equality, the calculational engine of modernity—physics, engineering, and computation—would have lacked its sharpest tool.

Yet equality is also deeply reductive. When we write $2 + 3 = 5$, the statement is not problematic; but when we write that two groups are "equal" or two spaces are "the same," the claim hides nuance. The equality sign flattens distinctions between objects that are not literally identical but instead structurally related. Two isomorphic groups are "the same" only insofar as their structures correspond, not because they are one and the same entity. Likewise, two topological spaces may be "the same" up to homeomorphism, but their equality is not an absolute identity—it is a statement about structure-preserving transformations. Equality, in its classical sense, lacks the vocabulary to express these richer correspondences, and in doing so it understates the fabric of mathematical reality.

It is here that Category Theory and Homotopy Type Theory offer a profound corrective. By reframing sameness in terms of equivalence, these frameworks elevate structural correspondence above rigid identity. The univalence axiom,

formulated by Vladimir Voevodsky, embodies this revolution: it asserts that equivalence implies identity, that two structures which are equivalent can be treated as the same within the universe of mathematics. This principle does not collapse difference but honors it, recognizing that "being the same" can mean "sharing a structure across higher paths and transformations." Where equality was a blunt assertion, equivalence is a hierarchy of correspondences—a universe of coherence.

Thus, the story of mathematics can be told as a progression: from the introduction of "=" as a symbol of rigid sameness, to its role as the backbone of modern calculation, to its recognition as an incomplete descriptor of mathematical reality. The rise of equivalence through CT and HoTT marks not merely a refinement but a paradigm shift. What was once concealed by the simplicity of equality is now revealed as a layered universe of equivalences, opening a path toward a more faithful foundation for mathematics—and, perhaps, a deeper understanding of the structures that underlie reality itself.

2. Equality in Classical Mathematics

Equality has traditionally been regarded as one of the primitive notions of mathematics—so basic that it is seldom questioned. In school arithmetic, equality is introduced as the claim that two expressions stand for the same quantity: $2 + 3 = 5$. From this foundation, algebra extends the concept, using "=" to assert that two symbolic expressions are interchangeable. Geometry adopts it to compare lengths, angles, or areas, while analysis builds entire theories of limits and continuity around the assertion that two values coincide. In every case, equality functions as the linchpin that makes substitution possible.

The substitution principle—often phrased as "equals may be replaced by equals"—is one of the most powerful tools of classical reasoning. If $x = y$, then wherever x appears, one may substitute y without altering the truth of a statement. This principle enables algebraic manipulation, proof by identity, and the verification of functional relationships. The ability to collapse expressions into

one another gave mathematics its calculational force, allowing generations of practitioners to reduce the complex to the simple and to treat sameness as absolute.

Yet as mathematics matured, this rigid notion of equality began to show its limitations. Consider two groups: the group of integers under addition and the group of even integers under addition. They are not strictly equal—their elements differ—but they are isomorphic, sharing the same algebraic structure. To treat them as equal would be false, but to treat them as wholly distinct misses the deeper truth: structurally, they are "the same." Similarly, in geometry and topology, two shapes may not be identical point for point, yet they can be homeomorphic, possessing a continuous, reversible transformation between them. A circle and a square are not equal in the classical sense, but as topological spaces they are equivalent. The blunt symbol "=" does not capture this nuance.

Even in analysis, where equality often appears sharpest, subtle failures emerge. Infinite series that converge to the same value are not equal term by term, but only in the limiting sense of analysis. Different representations of π—whether as a continued fraction, a trigonometric limit, or a geometric ratio—are not identical objects, yet we declare them equal. Classical mathematics handles these cases by fiat, flattening all such relationships into the rigid identity of "=." What gets lost is the structural correspondence that makes these equivalences meaningful.

In this way, equality in classical mathematics is both indispensable and inadequate. It underwrites the substitution rules that make formal reasoning possible, but it obscures the rich variety of "sameness" that arises across mathematical domains. The recognition of this gap sets the stage for Category Theory and Homotopy Type Theory, where equivalence is elevated to the foreground, and equality is reinterpreted as a special case rather than a primitive given.

3. Equivalence in Category Theory

Category Theory (CT) emerged in the mid–20th century as a unifying language for mathematics, created by Samuel Eilenberg and Saunders Mac Lane to clarify connections between algebraic topology and homological algebra. At its core, a category consists of objects and morphisms (arrows) that describe how objects relate. Unlike traditional frameworks that emphasize the internal constitution of an object, CT highlights the *network of relations* in which the object participates. An object is known not by its material but by its structural role in a web of transformations.

This relational perspective naturally shifts focus from rigid identity to equivalence. Two objects may not be identical, but if there exists a morphism with an inverse (an isomorphism), they are considered structurally the same. Generalizing further, two categories may not be identical—one may contain different objects and morphisms—but if there exists a functor between them that preserves structure up to isomorphism, they are called equivalent categories. Thus, CT builds sameness not from strict equality but from the existence of transformations that preserve essential structure.

This orientation embodies mathematical structuralism: what matters about a mathematical object is not its identity in isolation, but the features preserved under equivalence. For example, two groups may have different underlying sets, yet if there exists a bijection between them that respects group operations, they are isomorphic. In practice, mathematicians work “up to isomorphism,” treating such groups as indistinguishable. Similarly, vector spaces of the same dimension over a given field are not equal as sets of ordered tuples, but they are linearly equivalent; the specific coordinates chosen do not matter, only the dimension and field structure do.

Category Theory formalizes and legitimizes this pragmatic practice. It declares that structural correspondence—not rigid equality—is the true ground of mathematical identity. A circle and a square are different shapes, but as topological spaces they are homeomorphic; two categories built from distinct ingredients may nonetheless encode the same structural truths. CT makes this

explicit: what is essential in mathematics is precisely what can be carried along equivalences, transported faithfully through morphisms, functors, and natural transformations.

By codifying equivalence as fundamental, CT begins to loosen the stranglehold of the equality sign. It prepares the ground for Homotopy Type Theory, where equivalence is not merely a convenient tool but the very definition of identity itself. What CT hinted at—"what matters is preserved under equivalence"—HoTT makes foundational, transforming mathematics into a landscape where equivalence, not equality, reigns.

4. Homotopy Type Theory and the Univalence Axiom

Homotopy Type Theory (HoTT) deepens and radicalizes the structural perspective of Category Theory. Where CT emphasizes objects and morphisms, HoTT provides a foundation in which identity itself becomes a type, subject to the same scrutiny and richness as any other mathematical construction. Instead of treating equality as an external primitive, HoTT internalizes sameness into the fabric of the system.

In HoTT, every type carries with it an associated identity type. For any two terms a and b of a type A, the identity type $Id_a(b)$ represents the collection of ways in which a and b can be identified. This is not limited to a single verdict of "equal" or "not equal." Instead, it can contain paths—proofs or constructions that witness their sameness. Moreover, these paths themselves can be compared, leading to higher paths or homotopies between identifications. Thus identity in HoTT is not binary but hierarchical, with layers of coherence that can ascend indefinitely.

This insight owes much to homotopy theory in topology, where spaces are studied not by rigid pointwise equality but by the continuous deformations that preserve their structure. Just as two shapes are considered the same if one can be deformed into the other without tearing, HoTT generalizes this intuition: two mathematical objects are the same if there is a structured path of equivalence

between them. Equality becomes an inhabited type, a space of identifications rather than a blunt assertion.

It was Vladimir Voevodsky's great insight to push this idea to its logical extreme. In 2009, while developing HoTT as a new foundation for mathematics, he introduced the univalence axiom. The axiom asserts, in essence, that equivalence implies identity: if two types are equivalent, then they may be identified as the same. This is not merely a heuristic convenience but a foundational principle, embedding the structuralist viewpoint into the very logic of mathematics. Where classical foundations would insist that an isomorphic copy of the integers is not literally the integers, univalence allows us to treat them as identical.

The result is a paradigm shift: $\simeq$ becomes the new $=$. Identity is no longer an external decree; it is witnessed by the existence of equivalences, and equivalences are themselves objects of study with rich higher-dimensional structure. This reframing eliminates the artificial boundary between "true equality" and "mere equivalence," collapsing them into one coherent notion. With univalence, mathematics is no longer about static objects bound by primitive equality, but about structured universes where sameness is always mediated by transformation, coherence, and higher paths.

HoTT thus completes the trajectory hinted at by Category Theory. Where CT emphasized "working up to isomorphism," HoTT enshrines the principle that equivalence *is* identity. In this landscape, the classical equality sign "=" appears as an impoverished shadow of a deeper truth: that sameness in mathematics is relational, hierarchical, and alive with higher-dimensional structure.

5. A Pedagogical Table: = vs. ≃

The transition from equality to equivalence can be difficult to appreciate because "=" has been ingrained in mathematical thinking from the very beginning of education. A simple comparison can help make the differences clear.

Aspect	Classical Equality (=)	Equivalence (≃) in CT/HoTT
Nature	Absolute identity: two objects are literally the same.	Structural sameness: two objects correspond through equivalences.
Information	Flattens all distinctions into a binary verdict.	Preserves differences through paths, homotopies, and higher structures.
Operation	Substitution: replace equals with equals.	Transport: carry structures along equivalences, respecting coherence.
Scope	One-dimensional: $x = y$ is a flat assertion.	Multi-level: $x \simeq y$ may include multiple equivalences and higher homotopies.
Ontology	Treated as primitive, unquestioned.	Treated as derived from structured correspondences.
Philosophy	Sameness is fact-like.	Sameness is relation-like.
Tagline	"= is a statement."	"≃ is a universe."

This table illustrates that equivalence is not simply a replacement for equality but a richer concept that can *contain* equality as a special case. When two terms are definitionally identical (e.g., $2 + 3 = 5$), equivalence reduces to equality. But in more complex domains—groups, spaces, categories, types—the richer notion of ≃ is required to capture the layered ways in which objects may correspond.

The explanation of higher structures is crucial for pedagogy. In HoTT, identity is not just a yes/no judgment but a type that can contain multiple witnesses of sameness. For example, two paths showing that $a = b$ may themselves be connected by a higher path, and those higher paths may in turn be related at the

next level, producing an infinite hierarchy of coherence. This ladder of identities reveals that equivalence is not merely an external observation but an internal universe with its own geometry. Teaching this idea often benefits from visual metaphors: paths connecting points, surfaces connecting paths, and so on—an ascending structure where sameness itself has depth.

For students new to CT/HoTT, the pedagogical challenge is to loosen the grip of "=" without discarding its utility. One effective approach is to show how mathematicians already work informally "up to isomorphism." For instance, any two finite-dimensional vector spaces of the same dimension over $\mathbb{R}$ are regarded as "the same" in practice, even though they are not literally equal as sets. By framing these familiar habits as instances of equivalence, instructors can guide students toward the realization that equivalence is the deeper principle already at work in mathematics. From there, introducing univalence shows why $\simeq$ should replace = at the foundation.

6. Implications Beyond Mathematics

The move from equality to equivalence, while rooted in mathematics, resonates far beyond it. Many disciplines already operate as though equivalence were the real ground of sameness, and Category Theory and Homotopy Type Theory provide the formal language to recognize this explicitly.

Physics. Modern physics is pervaded by equivalence. Symmetries lie at the heart of fundamental laws, from rotational invariance to Lorentz transformations. Gauge theories—the backbone of the Standard Model—describe systems in which different field configurations are not literally equal but physically indistinguishable, related by a gauge equivalence. Similarly, string theory abounds with dualities: theories that appear distinct in formulation but describe the same underlying physics. Just as HoTT treats equivalence as identity, physics proceeds by declaring structurally equivalent descriptions as the same reality. The blunt tool of "=" gives way to a recognition that physical truth is often revealed only when we identify structures up to symmetry and transformation.

Artificial Intelligence. In AI, especially in pattern recognition and learning systems, rigid identity is rarely useful. A neural network trained to recognize a cat does not rely on pixel-by-pixel equality but on invariance to transformations: scale, rotation, lighting, even partial occlusion. What matters is not absolute identity but structural correspondence—an equivalence class of features that instantiate "catness." In more advanced AI research, such as representation learning, the goal is to discover latent spaces where equivalence captures semantic similarity. From this perspective, AI is already aligned with the shift from "=" to "≃," modeling reality not through rigid sameness but through structures preserved under transformation.

Philosophy. The implications run deepest in philosophy, where the very nature of identity and being is at stake. Classical metaphysics often sought to ground reality in substances whose identity was absolute, unchanging, and equal to themselves across time. Yet lived experience resists such rigidity: personal identity, for example, is not the persistence of an unchanging self but the coherence of memories, relationships, and narratives. In a HoTT-like vision, identity is not a fact but a structure—witnessed by equivalences across time, context, and relation. This perspective resonates with relational ontologies in both Western and Eastern thought, suggesting that "to be" is not to exist in isolation but to participate in networks of equivalence.

Thus, the transition from equality to equivalence is not a parochial technicality but a conceptual shift with wide reverberations. It aligns mathematics with physics' reliance on symmetries, with AI's emphasis on invariance, and with philosophy's turn toward relational being. In each case, the recognition is the same: sameness is not a flat identity but a structured correspondence that allows coherence to emerge from difference.

7. Vision: A Universe of Equivalence

If equality was the cornerstone of mathematics for centuries, equivalence may be the cornerstone of a new era. The univalence perspective invites us to reconsider

whether reality itself is better described not by rigid identities but by networks of structured correspondences. To say that two things are “the same” is, under this vision, not to assert that they are literally identical, but to recognize that their differences are bridged by transformations that preserve coherence. The shift is subtle yet profound: existence is not a collection of isolated objects with fixed essences, but a tapestry woven from equivalences, symmetries, and higher paths of relation.

Category Theory and Homotopy Type Theory offer a language for this vision. By placing equivalence at the foundation, they model sameness as layered, relational, and dynamic. A group is not an abstract “thing” equal to another, but part of a structure that is equivalent to countless others through isomorphism. A space is not rigidly defined by its coordinates, but by its class up to homeomorphism or homotopy equivalence. Even logical systems, once thought to stand apart in their absoluteness, may be better understood as equivalent frameworks whose transformations preserve truth in higher dimensions. Sameness, in this universe, is coherence itself.

The speculative consequences are immense. In science, a universe of equivalence suggests that the “laws of nature” may be nothing more than invariances under transformations—what persists across equivalences is what we call fundamental. In logic, it suggests a future in which proofs are not linear derivations but paths in a higher space of reason, with multiple routes converging on equivalence classes of truth. In metaphysics, it suggests that being is relational, that identity is not primitive but emergent from coherence. This resonates with the great structuralist traditions in philosophy and even with theological visions where unity arises not from sameness of substance but from equivalence of relation—many paths, one coherence.

To embrace equivalence as the deepest form of sameness is to recast our understanding of mathematics, science, and reality itself. The “=” that once anchored thought was never false, but it was incomplete. The “$\simeq$” that replaces it does not deny equality but enfolds it into a broader universe, where difference

and sameness coexist within structured harmony. The vision is one of coherence without collapse, unity without uniformity: a universe of equivalence.

8. Conclusion

The equality sign "=" has served mathematics with extraordinary success for nearly five centuries. From Recorde's first strokes on the page to the great engines of algebra, geometry, and analysis, equality has provided a concise and powerful way to declare sameness. It enabled the substitution principle, the solving of equations, and the rigorous formulation of scientific laws. In this sense, equality was indispensable: it gave mathematics its sharpest tool, and it carried human thought through the modern era of science and technology.

Yet equality, as rigid identity, was never the full story. In countless areas of mathematics, what practitioners truly meant by "same" was not literal equality but structural correspondence: isomorphic groups, homeomorphic spaces, equivalent categories. By collapsing these nuances into "=," classical foundations understated the richness of mathematical reality. It took the emergence of Category Theory and the visionary work of Voevodsky in Homotopy Type Theory to make explicit what mathematicians had long practiced: sameness is best understood through equivalence.

Equivalence, expressed as "≃," provides a more faithful foundation. It captures the layered, relational nature of identity, respecting differences while revealing coherence. With the univalence axiom, mathematics no longer distinguishes between "real" and "mere" equivalence—equivalence is identity. This perspective aligns with physics, with artificial intelligence, and even with philosophy, each of which already treats structural correspondence as the true measure of sameness.

The task now is pedagogical as much as it is theoretical. If future generations of mathematicians are to fully embrace this paradigm, they must be taught from the outset to think in equivalences rather than to default to equality. Textbooks, curricula, and even introductory courses can begin with examples where "up to isomorphism" is the natural language, gradually building intuition for why "≃ is

the new =." Such an approach not only clarifies mathematics but also harmonizes it with the deeper structures of science and thought.

The story of mathematics, then, is not the abandonment of equality but its enfolding into a richer vision. Equality was necessary, but equivalence is complete. To move from "=" to "≃" is to acknowledge that sameness is not a blunt fact but a universe of structured correspondences—an insight that may guide not only the future of mathematics, but also our understanding of reality itself.

Epilogue: Valence and Equivalence

The language of chemistry offers a vivid analogy for understanding the difference between equality and equivalence. Consider two atoms from the same group of the periodic table, such as sodium and potassium. They are not equal: their nuclei differ in size, mass, and composition, and their physical properties diverge in many respects. Yet when viewed through the lens of valence—the outermost electron shell that governs chemical bonding—they behave in strikingly similar ways. Both atoms possess a single electron in their valence shell, both tend to donate that electron, and both form +1 ions. For the purposes of bonding and reactivity, they can be regarded as structurally interchangeable.

In classical mathematics, one might be tempted to write "Na = K" to express their shared behavior, but such a statement would be false, collapsing real differences. Homotopy Type Theory provides the more faithful formulation: Na ≃ K with respect to their valence structure. Their equivalence is not literal identity but a structural correspondence—an equivalence class defined by their capacity to participate in analogous bonds. In this sense, chemistry has long anticipated the deeper logic of HoTT: sameness is not about collapsing difference into equality, but about recognizing the structured equivalences that allow coherence to emerge across distinction.

Just as valence unites distinct atoms in chemistry, equivalence unites distinct objects in mathematics—revealing coherence without erasing individuality.

References

- Eilenberg, S., & Mac Lane, S. (1945). *General Theory of Natural Equivalences*. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 58(2), 231–294.
- Mac Lane, S. (1998). *Categories for the Working Mathematician* (2nd ed.). Springer.
- Lawvere, F. W., & Schanuel, S. H. (2009). *Conceptual Mathematics: A First Introduction to Categories* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Awodey, S. (2010). *Category Theory* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Awodey, S. (2014). *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics*. Institute for Advanced Study.
- Voevodsky, V. (2015). *Univalent Foundations Project*. IAS Lecture Notes, Princeton.
- Riehl, E. (2016). *Category Theory in Context*. Dover Publications.
- Shulman, M. (2017). Homotopy type theory: A synthetic approach to higher equalities. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, Vol. 1, 369–396.
- Youvan, D. C. (2025). *Univalence, Emergence, and Humanity: Projecting the Future of Category Theory and Homotopy Type Theory*. August 2025. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.22543.50087
- Youvan, D. C. (2025). *From Solids to Spheres: Seeking Platonic Archetypes in Category Theory and Homotopy Type Theory*. August 2025. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.32504.97286
- Youvan, D. C. (2025). *Centaur Intelligence and the Aetherial Logos: CT/HoTT, AI, and Humanity in Further Creation*. August 2025. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.16986.04804

- Youvan, D. C. (2025). *Watching for Preconditions: A Thought Experiment on the Crystallization of CT/HoTT Universes*. August 2025. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.32767.11685

Vladimir Voevodsky 1966–2017

October 04, 2017

Press Contact | Alexandra Altman | aaltman@ias.edu | (609) 951-4406

Email Share Share Share

Photo by Andrea Kane

Vladimir Voevodsky, Professor in the School of Mathematics.